

IBS

VOLUME 8

JULY

1986



Property of
Graduate Theological Union

OCT 7 1986

BIBLICAL STUDIES

Volume 8

1986

Editor: Rev. Professor E.A. Russell
Union Theological College
Belfast BT7 1JT

Associate Editor: Professor Ernest Best
The University
Glasgow G12 8QQ

Assistant Editor: Mrs Margaret Bullock
Union Theological College
Belfast BT7 1JT

Editorial Advisory Panel:

Professor D.W. Gooding, 73 Myrtlefield Pk, Belfast
Rev Dr David Hill, The University, Sheffield S10 2TN
Dr J.G. McConville, Trinity College, Stoke Hill, Bristol
Rev Professor J.C. McCullough, John Knox College, Dunedin NZ
Principal R.J. McKelvey, The Congregational College, Whalley
Range, Manchester M16 8BP
Rev Professor J.S. McIvor, Union Theological College
Rev J. Murphy-O'Connor, L'École Biblique, Jerusalem
Rev. J.S. McPolin, S.J., Milltown Park, Dublin 6
Professor E. Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford
Rev Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College, Belfast
Mr David Payne, Registrar, London Bible College, Green
Lane, Northwood, Middlesex HA6 2UW
Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin 2

Subscriptions:

1986 (inclusive of postage):

Individuals £6.25 sterling or 7.50 Irish pounds

Institutions £9.50 sterling 16 US dollars

(All subscriptions should be made payable to "Irish
Biblical Studies" and addressed to the Assistant
Editor)

Copyright © IBS 1986

ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF THE

LATE VERY REVEREND PROFESSOR EMERITUS J.L.M. HAIRE,
M.A. (Oxford); B.D. (QUB); B.D. (London); M.Th
(London); D.D. h.c. (Edinburgh)

Contents

| | |
|--|---------|
| Editorial | 106-108 |
| D.F. Payne, The Elijah Circle and its Place in Kings | 109-114 |
| Ernest Best, A First Century Sect | 115-121 |
| John Thompson, Christian Doctrine, Yesterday and Today | 122-134 |
| David Hill, In Quest of Matthaean Christology | 135-142 |
| R. Buick Knox, The Presbyterianism of Samuel Rutherford | 143-153 |
| E.A. Russell, A Plea for Tolerance (Mark 9. 38-40) | 154-160 |

The late Very Reverend Professor Emeritus James Loughridge
Mitchell Haire

The essays in this issue of "Irish Biblical Studies" are in honour of the Very Reverend Professor Emeritus J.L.M. Haire, M.A. (Worcester College, Oxford); B.D. (Belfast); B.D. (London); M.Th (London); D.D. (Edinburgh), who died on 1 July 1985. "Jimmie", as he insisted on being called, and was affectionately known throughout the Irish Presbyterian Church and beyond, was born in Lurgan in 1909, in the manse of Hill St Church, son of the Rev James Haire, a native of Cullybackey, Co. Antrim. When just 3 years old, his father moved to the important city charge of Malone to be installed on 7th March 1912 and, seven years later, on 1 July 1919, he was elected by the General Assembly to the Chair of Systematic Theology and Apologetics in the Presbyterian College, Belfast (familiarily known as "Assembly's") from which he retired in 1944. Jimmie graduated at Oxford in Classics, and in Queen's University, Belfast in Divinity. Postgraduate studies followed at Zurich and Basel. In 1940 he was ordained to the congregation of Maghera in Co. Derry and four years later he succeeded his father in the Chair of Systematic Theology at the remarkable age of 34, retiring in 1976. From 1963 onward he was Principal of the College.

Within the College, it is even yet difficult to realize that one so dedicated to the welfare of the College and of the Church of his fathers is no longer with us, so deep was the impression he made on us all, both Faculty and students alike and so much was he part of the life of the College and Church he worked so hard to serve. He was a minister and teacher highly esteemed and trusted throughout the whole church, the friend of all and the enemy of none. It would be difficult to find one more committed or who used his considerable gifts with more self-discipline and energy. His boundless vitality and enthusiasm always amazed us.

One of the major influences in his life and thought was Karl Barth, some of whose writings he translated and to whose Festschrift of Essays he was invited to contribute, both at his 80th and 90th birthdays. In 1960, when the 400th anniversary of the Scottish Reformation was being celebrated,

mie was honoured by the University of Edinburgh with a
He was representative of the Irish Council of Churches
the Joint Committee on the New English Bible and was
ited to share in the work of the panel of translators
ing the years 1948-1961.

Like his father before him, Dr Haire became Moderator of
General Assembly in 1970, at a very tense period in the
e of the church and province (The "Troubles" broke out in
ust 1969). The duties of Moderator meant that he was
olved in considerable pastoral activity for church and
community. As Moderator, he journeyed to India to take part
the act of union of the Church of North India. For one
completely given over to ecumenism, it was an occasion of
at joy to see Presbyterians join with Anglicans, Methodists
tists and others in this remarkable and significant event.
Haire served for some time as Chairman of the Faith and
er Dept of the British Council of Churches (1954-1961)
Vice-President from 1965-1967.

Jimmie Haire was our church's most distinguished ecumenist
his time, sharing his vision and good sense within the
bership of the Irish Council of Churches for more than
ty years and striving with great courage and patience for
ty and reconciliation. Any cause that furthered understand-
within the church met with unfailing response as his
dy identification with the Corrymeela Community, the Irish
ool of Ecumenics and the Glenstal and Greenhills annual
menical conferences indicate. He was held in equal
eem throughout the main churches in Ireland, Protestant or
nolic, as a discerning counsellor, eirenic in spirit,
ad in outlook and sympathy and who, though deeply loyal
his own traditions, could yet see the value and importance
other traditions. In the midst of difficulties that might
e daunted men of less mettle, he preserved a boundless hope
expectation of better things to come.

As a member of the University Senate, he represented faith-
ly the concerns of theological education and acted as a
x man between the College and the University. He was a
dly and loyal colleague, a genial and attentive host,
uinely modest and humble of disposition so that few outside
ld realize the quality and extent of his gifts.

Jimmie was associated with the beginnings of the publicat-

ion "Biblical Theology" and when it ceased publication he continued his support for "Irish Biblical Studies" and was a regular and gifted contributor to its pages. At a time when difficulties face any publications of theological import, Jimmie's support and encouragement made it worthwhile.

Jimmie's family was one of the closest I have ever known. With all the tremendous commitment of time and energy that his responsibilities entailed, he had the constant support of his wife, Dr Margaret Haire, his two sons, James and William and his three daughters, Elizabeth, Rosemary, and Angela. In all the rich contributions Jimmie made to the cause of unity and reconciliation, they presented a wonderful context of strength and relaxation and happiness.

The Editor

D.F. Payne,

In the context of the books of Kings, which are visibly structured round the careers of the kings of Israel and Judah, the sequence of chapters unfolding the narratives about Elijah and Elisha come as something of a surprise to the reader, almost a digression from the main thrust of the whole. The kings, for instance, are regularly provided with a summary and critical evaluation; we find nothing of the sort for the prophets, though of course the biblical writer's high regard for them may be taken for granted. It is interesting to observe, moreover, that two of the most significant recent studies of the whole Deuteronomistic History pay an almost insignificant amount of attention to this whole block of material. Scholarship is undecided about the status of the prophetic layer of material in Kings. It is clear, at any rate, that it is readily possible to view the Elijah cycle of narratives (to take the major example) as contributing little to the books of Kings, or to the Deuteronomistic History, taken as a whole.

Two possible historical settings are particularly important. One is the period of the Babylonian Exile, which is the actual period reached by 2 Kings, and in which undoubtedly the Deuteronomistic History was either written or completed. The other possible setting is the reign of Josiah (late seventh century BC), in which the first edition of the Deuteronomistic History may have been compiled, in the view of a number of recent scholars, such as R.D. Nelson and A.D.H. Mayes. To which era, if either, does the Elijah material seem particularly relevant?

Whatever the origins and sources of the narratives about Elijah, it is clear enough that the material is mostly episodic, with relatively little to bind the stories together. For that reason alone, it is tempting to treat each narrative in its own right, without exploring wider perspectives. Moreover, with rare exceptions, there is little evidence of editorial touches; so that it is easy enough to deduce or assume that a deuteronomistic compiler utilized existing material to illustrate

such general points as the wickedness of the kings of the Northern Kingdom, the importance of heeding God's prophetic word, and above all the effect of the divine word on the history of Israel under the kings. The question arises whether it is possible to probe deeper and find theological perspectives here which are consonant with deuteronomistic teachings directed at a specific audience. Opinions differ whether the prophetic material incorporated in the Deuteronomistic History represents an independent layer ("DtrP"), just as opinions differ as to how many deuteronomistic writers and editors there were behind the Deuteronomistic History as we know it; but if any of the so-called Deuteronomistic School was a man who inserted the narratives about Elijah and the other prophets into his history of the monarchy, then we may reasonably suppose that he found in this prophetic material theological perspectives he shared.

Let us then examine 1 Kings 17 - 2 Kings 1 with a view to assessing the relevance of each section to deuteronomistic interests. Elijah is abruptly introduced in 1 Kings 17. His first deed is to enunciate the word of Yahweh to King Ahab, after which the drought brought about by that word provides the setting and background to the events of this chapter and the next. God's word, then, is depicted as bringing hardship on the whole nation; but in chapter 17 the reader's interest is drawn not to king or nation but to specific individuals affected by the drought, namely Elijah himself and the widow of Zarephath and her ailing son. The word of Yahweh remains a key motif; the same powerful word which had produced the drought provided miraculous sustenance first for Elijah at Cherith, then for the widow and her household along with the prophet. Finally the word of Yahweh restored life to the woman's son. Obedience to the word of Yahweh was the prerequisite for all this miraculous provision in a desperate situation.

How would a deuteronomist have read this story against the setting of his time? Its relevance to an exilic situation is at any rate not hard to see. The word of God through prophet after prophet had brought about the

fall of the kingdom of Judah (as of Israel before it) and the nation found itself in hardship and despair; this was undoubtedly deuteronomistic teaching, whether we assign it (as did M. Noth³) to the whole Deuteronomistic History or to the final deuteronomist of two or three such authors. The drought of 1 Kings 17 offers an analogy to exilic conditions; but there is a message of hope in it, that obedience to the divine word can transform the situation for the individual, bringing blessing and life in a miraculous and unforeseen way. While there was no doubt a general truth here, it would be difficult to find any direct relevance in such a message to the happier and more optimistic days of King Josiah, on the hypothesis that the first edition of the Deuteronomistic History took shape in his reign.

In Chapter 18 we encounter the contest on Mount Carmel, when Elijah successfully challenged the ascendancy of the Baal prophets and their god. The existing political supremacy of the Baal cult in Samaria is emphasized in this narrative; only a miracle could and did remedy the situation. Courageous fidelity to Yahweh, against all odds and appearances, transformed the situation, bringing to an end both the supremacy of those who worshipped pagan gods and also the damaging drought. Here again the relevance of such themes to an exilic situation is clear enough, when the (idolatrous) Babylonians were rampant and Yahweh seemed defeated and powerless. It is true that Josiah's reforms sought to eradicate idolatry, and to that extent the thrust of 1 Kings 18 would have been entirely appropriate for his era too; but the relevance of 1 Kings 18 would have been even greater for exilic readers.

Chapter 19 begins by depicting Elijah's fear of Jezebel's threats and his flight to Horeb, en route partaking of a miraculous meal. This rather unexpected human failing on Elijah's part would at least induce a fellow-feeling on the part of exilic readers overawed by threatening circumstances. Once again miraculous provision is there for the taking: Yahweh seeks only fidelity and obedience, not superhuman courage. Thus far the thrust of the chapter largely reinforces that

of chapter 17; but with the theophany at Horeb (19:9-13) we are confronted with very different material. The difficulty here is that the meaning of the theophany is far from obvious; numerous explanations and interpretations have been proposed.⁴ If however we put aside the problem of the original significance of the passage, it may not be so difficult to find a value for an exilic audience. Wind, earthquake and fire stand in some sort of contrast to the word of God which climaxes the vision. There is at least no doubt about the stress laid in the whole Elijah cycle on the word of Yahweh; that is what exilic readers must heed and obey. It may be that for the deuteronomistic author the wind, earthquake and fire were seen not so much as contrast to the quiet voice of Yahweh as prior to it; for these destructive symbols of Yahweh's activity had already shown themselves in the harsh realities of the Babylonian onslaught on Judah and Jerusalem. Alternatively, if wind, earthquake and fire primarily symbolized Yahweh's presence in the cult,⁵ then the deuteronomist, writing during the exile, could readily have used the theophanic description to teach that despite the loss of cult and temple, Yahweh still revealed himself in the prophetic word. There can be no certainty of interpretation, but some such meaning for exilic readers makes good sense.

The remainder of the section (19:14-18) gives explicit instructions and predictions relevant only to the time of Elijah and Elisha, but it also contains a theme of hope suited to later times. International upheavals could not but result in many Israelite deaths; but the very fact of the existence of many devout people - even if visible only to Yahweh - was the seed of promise and hope for the future.

We next meet Elijah in chapter 21. This chapter, devoted to the story of Naboth's vineyard, contains more signs of deuteronomistic activity than is usual in the Elijah cycle. The deuteronomist in verses 25-26 refers explicitly to the idolatry practised by Ahab, and blames Jezebel for inciting him. This assessment of Ahab and Jezebel relates directly to chapter 18; no idolatry is involved or mentioned in the Naboth incident itself. Verse 25, however,

serves to bring together the social and moral evil displayed in the Naboth affair and the religious evil described in the earlier passage: "There was none who sold himself to do what was evil in the sight of the Lord like Ahab, whom Jezebel his wife incited." Jezebel had taken a leading hand in both evils. For the deuteronomist, the Naboth story may well have served to illustrate his conviction that idolatry, religious evil, worked itself out in moral corruption and maladministration. Thus the Naboth story confirmed the recurring deuteronomistic theme that idolatry brought about the downfall of the monarchs and the monarchy, in Israel and Judah alike. The theme is patently exilic, not Josianic.

Precisely the same theme recurs in 2 Kings 1, where we next meet Elijah. Now the king is no longer Ahab but his successor Ahaziah; like his father, Ahaziah turns to a foreign pagan god, and Elijah immediately appears on the scene to pronounce his death sentence for idolatry. And as predicted, the word of Yahweh brought about this king's death in turn.

The account of Ahab's death⁶ in 1 Kings 22 makes no mention of Elijah, and doubtless the chapter depends on different sources. Here the prophet who opposed the king is Micaiah. The general message is the same, however, attributing the fall of the monarch to his conflict with the inexorable word of Yahweh. One aspect of the story which may well have appealed to the deuteronomist is Micaiah's prediction in verse 17 that Ahab's fall in battle would in effect spare the lives of his citizens rather than harm them. In the exilic deuteronomistic perspective, the fall of the monarchy in reality benefited the nation; again, such a perspective would be inappropriate for Josiah's time when a good and devout king was implementing much-needed reforms.

To sum up, then, we can suggest that the Elijah cycle was far from irrelevant to the theological concerns of the biblical historians, provided that we keep an exilic situation in mind. If the "twofold redaction" (Nelson's

title) of the Deuteronomistic History becomes the regnant hypothesis in Old Testament scholarship, we should attach the Elijah cycle to the later redaction of the two.

* This short paper is offered in warmly affectionate memory of J.L.M. Haire, whose consistent devotion both to the Scriptures and to sound and careful exegesis was an inspiration. *Zichrono li-berachah.*

NOTES:

1. I refer to R.D. Nelson, The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History (Sheffield, 1981) and A.D.H. Mayes, The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile (London, 1983). The "Deuteronomistic History" is the sequence of biblical books Deuteronomy - Joshua - Judges - Samuel - Kings.
2. For a recent survey, see G.H. Jones, 1 and 2 Kings (New Century Bible Commentary, Grand Rapids and London, 1984), vol. 1, pp.28-44.
3. Cf. M. Noth, Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Tuebingen, 1943); in English, The Deuteronomistic History (Sheffield, 1981).
4. See Jones, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 332f., for a concise survey of interpretations.
5. Cf. Jones, ibid.
6. Modern discussions about the identity of the king of Israel in 1 Kings 22 are not relevant to this paper; to the deuteronomist, at any rate, the king who fell at Ramoth-gilead was Ahab.

Shortly after I graduated in theology I was invited to join an ecumenical study group one of whose leading members was Jimmie Haire. Most of our time was devoted to discussing the nature of the church as seen in the New Testament, among the Fathers, at the time of the Reformation and today. I do not believe we ever dealt in detail with the point which is raised in this article though much we said bordered on it.

The first two clauses of 1 Peter 2.17, a text well-known in N. Ireland because of its appearance on Orange Order banners, raise the issue: 'Honour all men. Love the brotherhood'. The brotherhood in this letter is of course the church and not the Orange Order. The text makes a distinction in the way Christians should treat one another from the way they should treat those not of the church. Such a distinction is regularly found in sects. Hence the title of the essay.

We need to begin by saying something about how the term 'sect' is used in this brief essay. It is not used in the way many Christians who belong to the larger churches use it of small bodies whom they regard as on the fringe of Christianity but rather in the way in which sociologists employ it. The people to whom 1 Peter is written though a small body were not a small body on the fringes of a great church. There was no great church. They were a small body on the fringe of a wholly non-Christian culture. As such they might be expected to display some of the characteristics which sociologists detect in 'sects'. Such groups normally have, at least in their own view, clearly defined boundaries which set them off from the surrounding society. They seek to keep themselves pure from its contaminating influence. They take great care of their own members and if misfortune befalls one of them the remainder are assiduous in rendering assistance. They adopt rigid doctrinal and ethical positions and are not slow to deal with members who fail in these respects. All this suggests a certain exclusiveness, yet they are not exclusive in the sense that they do not seek more members; they are normally avidly missionary minded. It is clear that at least some of these features distinguished some sections of the first

century church as described in the New Testament.

Now to return to 1 Peter and the distinction it draws in the attitude Christians should adopt to one another and to outsiders. The emphasis on love within the brotherhood is found elsewhere in the letter (1.22; 4.8) and at many other points in the New Testament (Rom. 12.10; 1 Thess. 4.9-12; Heb. 13.1). The idea is also expressed in other ways, especially in the phrase 'love one another' (John 13.34-5; 15.12,17; 1 John 3.23). The term 'brother' almost certainly entered Christianity from Judaism via Jesus but was easily appreciated by Gentiles who became Christians because of its use in contemporary religious cults. For Christians it represented the close way in which they felt themselves related to one another as members of the same family (cf. Mark 3.31-35; 10.29-30). In many cases the ties of biological kinship in which they had been nurtured were shattered when they became Christians; within the church however they found themselves members of a new family which cared for them as much as if not more than their old families had done. Although other passages in the New Testament emphasise the need to love fellow-Christians the distinction drawn in 1 Peter 2.17 between the two attitudes to fellow-Christians and to non-Christians is not found in any of them. The sustained stress on love to fellow-Christians may suggest it lay unexpressed in the minds of their authors but this cannot be proved.

It is this distinction which is puzzling and perhaps embarrassing. When we examine what Jesus said we find the distinction is not only missing but contradicted. Jesus took up the Jewish teaching on the love of one's neighbour (Lev. 19.18), which contemporary Jews understood as meaning that Jew should love fellow-Jew, and he changed it into a love for all men. This is the burden of the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10.25-37; cf Mark 12.28-34). When again Jesus said to his followers that they should love their enemies (Matt. 5.43-44) he was not suggesting that they should love only their enemies who were fellow-Jews but all, whether Jews or Gentiles, whom they regarded as enemies.

When Paul comes to talk about love we have seen that he does speak of love within the brotherhood but unlike the other writers of the New Testament he also speaks of

love for all men with an emphasis like that of Jesus. Love of neighbours is the fulfilling of the law (Rom. 13.8-10; Gal. 5.14). In Gal. 5.14 Paul ties the general law to the particular case of the way Christians should treat one another as v.15 shows and in 1 Thess. 3.12 he connects love to all men with love to fellow-Christians (cf Gal. 10.6). Love for the brotherhood is then for Paul a special case of love for all men. He is thus clearly aware of the the universal nature of the command of Jesus though he applies it in some instances to the internal life of the church. In some of the other writers of the New Testament, as we have seen, the existence of the general command is not recognised and the narrower command of love of the brotherhood is stressed. This means that for Paul unlike these other writers there was no danger of thinking that Christians and non-Christians should be treated differently. If that distinction is a characteristic of a sect for Paul the church is not a sect.

Returning to 1 Peter and the distinction in the ways people should be treated we can see that the existence of the distinction implies that at least in the writer's mind and in those of his readers it would known who were brothers and who were not. Those within the church would be able to recognise their fellow-members and the church would have clearly defined boundaries. This is a another characteristic of the sectarian mentality. But if boundaries go with different treatment for those within and without them and if Jesus taught that all men should be treated in the same way does this mean that he did not draw a line round his followers marking them off from those who were not his followers? He certainly laid down conditions to be fulfilled before anyone could count himself as a follower. But these were not the kind of conditions which can be easily used to draw rigid lines. Who can legislate to define 'crosses' if bearing the cross is the sign of discipleship (Mark 8.34)? Who can enter into the mind of others to determine whether they have been born again if this is what makes them Christians (John 3.5)?

That Jesus did not draw rigid lines can be seen more positively in other ways. He taught that God made no distinction in the way he treated people since he sends

his rain and makes his sun to shine equally without discrimination on the evil and the good (Matt. 5.45; note that this is linked to the passage about loving one's enemies and thus provides a basis for treating all men and women in the same way). One day John complained to Jesus that there was a man practising exorcism in the name of Jesus who did not belong to the group of disciples; John had forbidden him to continue to do so. John had obviously a clear idea that there should be a defined boundary around the group of the followers of Jesus and he knew where he would draw it and who was in it and who was not. Jesus however would not agree with John and told him that those who were not against him were for him. This is unpleasant doctrine for Christians who like to be able to lay down rules to determine who are Christians and who are not. Matthew who has been described as the ecclesiological evangelist apparently found the incident not to his taste and omitted it!

One of the complaints made by his contemporaries against Jesus was his friendship with those classed by surrounding society as immoral (Matt. 11.19; Luke 7.34). After Levi's response to his call to join him Jesus went to a party, probably in Levi's house, where there were many such immoral people. When he was criticised he responded by saying that he had come not to call the righteous but sinners (Mark 2.17). We are so accustomed to this text in the form Luke gives it where he adds 'to repentance' that we forget that Jesus was speaking of calling people to himself (or possibly 'to God'). He did not lay down a condition, repentance, which had to be fulfilled by those with whom he would associate. His call was competely open. His criticisms of the Pharisees were fierce because they made their rules defining the boundaries and shut the kingdom of heaven against the access of others (Matt. 23.13). Their whole attitude was one of exclusiveness.

If then Jesus laid down this emphasis at the beginning and if we find in 1 Peter a distinction drawn between the way Christians should treat other Christians and the way they should treat non-Christians how did the change come about? That Christians should stress their love for one another is perfectly natural since they regarded themselves as a family and since it is always

easier to love those who love us than those who are indifferent, if not positively hostile, to our love. The awareness that our love will be returned will of itself create in our minds a distinction between those who so return it and those who do not. The boundaries of the 'family' are created by the mutual relation of the members to one another. If moreover the members are seen to love one another this makes it easier for those who are not Christians to perceive the reality of the love Christians preach about. All men will know that we are Christ's disciples when we love one another (John 13.34).

There were however much more important factors which led to the drawing of boundaries and the distinction in attitude towards Christians and non-Christians. If other Christians returned love when it was shown the rest of the world usually did not, and in many cases was actively hostile. The formal or governmental persecution of Christians was only sporadic in the first century. Nero may have punished them for allegedly setting fire to Rome but there was no general persecution throughout the empire. There is however strong evidence in the New Testament that Christians frequently suffered at the hands of their immediate neighbours or the local authorities (e.g. Acts 17.5-9; Heb. 10.32-33). We can realise how common this must have been when we remember how the first Christians in the new mission fields of the nineteenth century suffered similar hostile pressure even though their controlling colonial governments were friendly to Christianity.

Pressure from outside would then drive the Christians in on themselves and define their boundaries for them even if they had no desire to do this for themselves. There was of course much more than actual persecution which led to outsiders seeing the distinction between themselves and Christians and which led to Christians needing to draw the boundaries more clearly. We can see this in Paul's long discussion of what to do in regard to the eating of food sacrificed to idols. Some had great difficulty in deciding whether they should eat or not. They felt the pagan world pressing in on them and needed a clear line to be drawn which would preserve them from falling back into their former pagan ways. They would have felt the same in respect of many other areas of

their new lives. That Christians adopted different standards from pagans in respect of many of these matters meant that they became aware of themselves as a unit, and so of their boundaries.

If Christians were to be successful in their evangelism it was important that the world should think well of them and their behaviour. So we find Paul relating love for the brethren to the exhortation that they should be careful of the impression they made on others (1 Thess. 4.9-12). If men saw the genuine nature of their love for one another they would give God the glory, i.e. become Christians (Matt. 5.16; cf. 1 Pet. 2.12). When Christians quarrel among themselves the world turns away from them. What then happens when there are those within the church who by their behaviour cause it to be criticised? What happens if someone behaves in a way that would be regarded as immoral even by non-Christians? Such a person must be excluded from the fellowship (1 Cor 5.1-5); the old leaven must be cleared out so that the new leaven of the gospel may be seen (1 Cor. 5.6-8). We should note in passing that Paul does not regard the incestuous believer as irrevocably damned when expelled from the fellowship; he hopes that expulsion will result in his salvation (5.5). The church then to maintain its own good name was forced to discipline those of its members who went astray. The act of discipline gradually produced definitions as to what constituted the boundaries of the church.

We can begin to see then how the church in some areas, for 1 Peter may not be typical of all areas, gradually began to take on sectarian characteristics. These did not come from an inner dynamic within the church working itself out but rather from the pressure exerted on the church by the cultural situation in which it existed. There is little evidence that it was fostered by any sense that the church proudly possessed the truth in a way that no other group did, as we find in some fringe sects today. The cases of discipline which helped in defining boundaries arose at this stage more out of divergences in behaviour than of belief. There appears indeed to have been considerable variety of belief within the New Testament church.

Sectarianism, if we may put it like that, was then

forced on the church rather than being a necessary characteristic of its nature and existence. It grew out of the hostile situation in which the church found itself in the first century. Such hostility towards the church is still found in many parts of the world today, but in others it is missing. Where that hostility is absent the church then must always be careful not to adopt an unnecessarily rigid sectarian position, though of course it will from time to time have to define its boundaries in respect of belief and behaviour. Its history shows that it has always been too eager to exclude and has adopted more often the attitude of the Pharisees than that of Jesus. His teaching must never be ignored in the rush to exclude those we do not like or of whose faith or morals we do not approve.

In an article in the Reformed World John W. de Gruchy writes "Doctrine is that which the Christian community believes to be true arising out of its reflection on the Apostolic tradition in relation to the situation in which the believing community exists today. It is not the product of any one theologian or school, but the Church giving an account of its faith." By apostolic tradition the writer obviously means Holy Scripture, the testimony of the prophets and apostles to God's revelation. If we make that change, this is fine and comprehensive definition. It says five things which I wish to take up elaborate and expand.

1. Doctrine is bound up with faith, with believing.
2. It raises and seeks to answer the question of Christian truth.
3. It is based on the original witness of the prophets and apostles to God's action in Israel and in Jesus Christ as we find it in Holy Scripture.
4. The understanding and interpretation of doctrine is carried out within the context of the believing community, the Church.
5. It is not an isolated body of belief but a living dynamic content intimately related to life both in the Church and in the world.

1. The Nature of Doctrine.

Doctrine is the essence of what we believe based on God's self-motivation and cannot really be understood or interpreted if we take it out of this context or apart from it. The older theology in the Protestant tradition said that this act of believing, which gives us the content of doctrine, has three elements, notitia (knowledge), assensus (acceptance of certain things as true, and fiducia (trust), to know, to accept and to trust, though not all theologians put them in this order. John Calvin, for example, states that all knowledge begins in obedience. In other words, if one thing comes first, it is an act of obedient trust in the God who comes, speaks and acts for us men and for our salvation in Jesus Christ. This has been taken up and made the starting point for the whole of his Church Dogmatics by Karl Barth, who repeatedly quotes Calvin at this particular point. Faith

is not primarily acceptance of certain dogmas with the mind, but the committal of one's self to God in Christ. It does, of course, imply a certain form of knowledge at the same time. Or to put it otherwise, we cannot think about and know the faith except from within, as believers, as those whom God in his sovereign lordship and grace has called and brought into fellowship with himself through Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit. It is out of this believing response that the mind knows, confesses and expresses. Barth has put the order in this way; we acknowledge by faith Jesus Christ as Lord: anerkennen. In this acknowledgement we know who he is: erkennen, and as such we confess him in the Church and world: bekennen. All these are forms of kennen, all forms of knowledge, but it is out of the abundance of the heart that the mouth speaks. Our doctrine, our expression of the content of revelation is therefore a form of obedience, a form of trust and knowledge, a prayer, an act of worship. It is doxological.

P.T. Forsyth in his cryptic but illuminating way states that doctrine is 'the theology of the twice-born', and Emil Brunner says, it is 'believing thinking'. It is thinking about our faith from within the act of believing in all its compass of trust, knowledge and confession. In this God is always the Sovereign over our acting, believing and thinking; we cannot simply treat him as another object, but as a subject who always addresses us.

If therefore it is within the faith itself that doctrine can be rightly understood and interpreted, then three consequences follow. First there can be little place for apologetics. The duty of the Christian, the Church and the theologian is clear; it is not just to acknowledge and to know but to confess, to bear witness. It is a belief seeking to understand and to give others to understand. It is to confess Christ before men. Secondly, a limitation is put upon dialogue with others. If we can only understand our faith from within and if others indeed are the same, then to speak about and to listen to others' beliefs while a right and proper thing

nonetheless has its limitations. And these limitations are imposed not by an unwillingness to learn of or from others but by the very nature of faith as more than statements, as in fact involving a life commitment. Yet true dialogue can and indeed must take place as a form of mutual witness, a personal meeting of people in what they believe and are.

Thirdly, all speaking about God is speaking about him in the presence of God. All our statements of faith come under his judgment and, however right, proper and orthodox we may think them to be and must seek to make them, they are all limited, human and relative.

Both Karl Barth and T.F. Torrance have pointed to the inadequacy of our human language to convey the divine revelation and have stated that this language can only be made suitable and true as God himself takes it and uses it to channel and convey himself as the Truth.

2. The Necessity of Doctrine.

It is necessary because, according to our definition, it raises the question of the truth of revelation. Now when we speak about Christian truth we must be careful how we use the term. We are not using it simply in the ordinary understanding of it as correct statements of facts or beliefs though it includes that, but in the way in which it is used in the Hebrew-Christian tradition of 'doing the truth', as John's Gospel puts it, doing the will so that we may know the doctrine. Nonetheless, even with this understanding of the practical and living nature of the biblical idea of truth, within the pages of the New Testament itself it was found necessary to state what the apostolic tradition was and what it was not, what was the centre and what the circumference of the faith and what was altogether outside that circumference. To put it in the language of the Rule of Faith there was a need for a statement of doctrine "as a testimony for truth and against error and serve as a bond of union for the members of the Church." Already within the New Testament itself there was a tradition or there were traditions of

central affirmation, a kerygma, a preached message centering around the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Already within the New Testament there was teaching that in these events God acted once for all for our salvation and other views which threatened these truths like Docetism which said Jesus was not a real man, or Gnosticism that said there was a secret Gnosis or knowledge known only to the elite, are false. These views threatened central teaching. There was already then a tradition of true apostolic teaching (however varied) which faithfully reflected the significance of the events surrounding Jesus Christ.

Nor was it long into Christian history before great men like Irenaeus and Tertullian were obliged to seek out and state what was called a regula fidei, a rule of faith saying what the apostolic tradition was, in other words, what was the essential truth of the faith as given in Holy Scripture. This is what doctrine is and tries to be. In every age it seeks to state as De Gruchy said, what the Christian community believes to be true.

It is still necessary to argue this in some quarters, for there are still those who seem to think that it doesn't really matter what we believe, it is what we do that counts. As if the question of truth were irrelevant or if what we believe did not touch us at the very core of our being and did not influence profoundly the whole of our actions. De Gruchy states that this sort of thinking and this way of speaking should be discarded as quite untrue. The equally real danger from the other side is that a simple acceptance of a set of doctrines is itself a proof of one's soundness, not to speak of one's acceptance by God and one's fellow-members in the Church. The two dangers to be avoided are on the one hand an undogmatic Christianity and a too dogmatic one. Perhaps one might also add a third view here, that Christian truth is also not to be equated simply with a particular type of religious experience, a far too subjective view of the faith. It is based on and continues to be judged by God's personal revelation and reconciliation in Jesus Christ his Son.

3. The Standard of Doctrine

This is quite simply the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments or rather, to put it more correctly, God himself as he reveals himself in the history of Israel and in Jesus Christ, testimony to which one finds authoritatively given in the Scriptures. The supreme standard of the Church and the sole source and judge of doctrine is God himself speaking in his word; the sola scriptura of the Reformers must stand. There is only one source of authority and that is the living, redeeming God himself as he comes and speaks and acts in and through his word by the renewing, internal testimony of the Holy Spirit. This is over against the view that Tradition separate from the Scriptures has a binding authority in the same way as the Scriptures. It is also over against the view that the Spirit has an immediate and not a mediated authority.

Here it must be said that Vatican II made a noble, even if not entirely successful, attempt to state something like this, to return to what is known as the one-source theory of revelation and authority, not Scripture and tradition as before "to be received with equal affection of piety and gratitude" as the Council of Trent said in the 16th century, but God as He reveals Himself to man in redeeming action in Israel and in Christ. The qualification that the Magisterium, the Hierarchy of Pope and Bishops is the sole guardian and the authentic interpreter of this revelation puts somewhat of a distance between the Roman Catholic and the Reformed position in relation to Scripture and seems to me not to subordinate sufficiently Church teaching to Holy Scripture.

Granted that we acknowledge the supreme authority of our canonical Scriptures in all matters of faith, doctrine and life the question arises how were these recognised? Why and how choose certain books as Scriptural and not others? We must exclude the view that there are human yardsticks above the Word which prove it to be the Word and other writings not. The chief answer that the Reformed tradition has given is that it is by the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit that writings are seen and proved to be the Word of God and so authoritative for the

Church and Christian life. The view that the Church decided what books were canonical and what not is a half-truth. To be sure certain human criteria were advanced by the early Church like apostolicity etc., and later ages tried to show the Scriptures to be authoritative on rational grounds and largely paid the price by leading to rationalism. But neither the Church nor human reason in fact did choose ultimately however active they were and are in all our Christian decisions.

Emil Brunner and Karl Barth have stated clearly the implications of our Reformed tradition's teaching in the phrase 'Only God can prove what is God's.' We decide in favour of these books and not others because it has already been decided for us. The Scriptures are to that extent self-authenticating. The central thing that made the Church accept these and not other books was the fact that they so impressed themselves upon the mind and life of the Church by the Holy Spirit that it was felt one couldn't do otherwise than acknowledge their authority. At the same time other writings were simply set to one side because they were not of the same standard nor had they the same relation to God's revelation as these. The ratification of the Church did not make it a judge over Scripture nor itself the authority but simply acknowledged the reality of the truth of the writings by which the Church actually lived.

In other words they were found to be an authentic testimony by the Spirit to God's action in Israel and in Jesus Christ his Son. 'These are they which testify of Me.' - a human testimony to revelation but at the same time one through which God continually speaks today. It is in this sense that the Scriptures are the Word of God. Here in a very special way the Church has found the standard and ultimate *raison d'être* of its life and doctrine.

4. Doctrine in the context of the Church.

It has been said that as individuals we may get along for a time or even a lifetime with a little theology or doctrine, but a Church over its long history just

simply cannot. What a Church is is profoundly influenced in the short and in the long term by what it believes and what it believes it is the prerogative and duty of the Church to set out under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and in the light of Holy Scripture. This it has done in the past and crystallised in creeds and confessions as guidelines for the life and work, for the faith and action of the Church. We look now at this particular point, at the question of the nature of a creed or confession, as a statement of doctrine, which is a vital and relevant one to our own situation here today. As statements of the faith hammered out in the heat of controversies and often in situations of crisis confessions are documents of relative authority and considerable significance. They are part of the Church's tradition, which, in the Reformed understanding, must always be subordinate to the supreme standard, God's word in Holy Scripture.

What then should be our attitude towards these traditional statements of doctrine? It can be summed up in this phrase "Respectful freedom in relation to tradition". The respect comes first; respect because here is the voice of the fathers and brethren who have gone before us in the Church. They were seeking in their own time and way to state as fully and clearly as possible the essence of the apostolic faith. To dismiss them as irrelevant, to by-pass them as simply antiquated is to do disrespect to great thinkers who wrestled with and sought to express the meaning of Holy Scripture. Respect too for the communion of saints as a living reality today and these not simply as dead voices, but as living ones in the Church of Jesus Christ who speaks to us both across the centuries and in the fellowship of faith, giving a testimony to which we must faithfully listen and give heed. Is it not a fact that it is from the perspective of our traditions, whether they are fully formulated in credal or confessional form or not, that all of us, perhaps more than we know, approach and understand Holy Scripture and its teaching and live our Christian lives. Those of us who are Presbyterians, for example, are still profoundly influenced by the

Westminster Fathers, particularly by the Shorter Catechism, in the whole of our life and work, whether we react wholly positively to all they say or not.

Yet it is respect which is combined with freedom, not any kind of freedom, but a freedom to look at the past statements afresh today and to re-formulate them in the light of the Word. It may be that in most cases we will come to exactly the same conclusions as our forefathers. We may, for example be able to accept the Chalcedonian formula about the Person of Christ hammered out in 451, as a good and fair statement of Christology. Or, it may be, that at certain points we may find emphases and statements which do not fully accord with our present understanding of Holy Scripture. We have to have this freedom which a strict confessionalism that seems almost entirely tied to the past and almost absolutises traditional formulae would in fact deny. To take this stance is paradoxically to deny the basic position it attempts to defend, namely, the priority and supremacy of the revelation of God testified in Holy Scripture. It is to give to particular traditional formulations more than they were ever meant to have, even by those who originally formulated them. Karl Rahner has rightly said that a Confession of Faith is both an end and a beginning, both a relative conclusion of a period of reflection on the faith and yet the point from which we set out, on the basis of Holy Scripture, to think afresh. And we must think afresh if we are to relate the faith to life today.

Again, is it not a fact that part of our Reformed tradition is that we are a reformed Church continually submitting ourselves to reformation in accordance with the Word of God and this reformation is not just in life but in doctrine. G.C. Berkouwer in his book on The Second Vatican Council, has put it in this way, 'The limitation of faith's answer does not mean that the answer is untrue. It only means that it cannot exhaust the truth and that it knows it cannot. Because truth and revelation have a personal, human character, every formula of faith can be surpassed; on principle it can

be exchanged for another formula that says more and yet says the same thing.' ² Should we not be trying to do that today, to say the same thing better? Karl Barth has written, 'If divine infallibility cannot be ascribed to any Church's confession, then in practice we have to recognise that every Church confession can be regarded only as a stage on a road which can as such be relativised and succeeded by a further stage in the form of an altered Confession. Therefore, respect for its authority has necessarily to be conjoined with a basic readiness to envisage a possible alteration of this kind.'³ So Christian doctrine yesterday must not be a fetter to bind us merely to a tradition or particular historical time and expression but a pointer beyond to God and his Word, to him who, while having acted decisively in the past in the history of Jesus Christ, is the Lord over our life and our thinking today and calls us afresh to obedience in life and thought in his service.

5. The Relation between Doctrine and Practice.

In this final section I want to try and show how doctrine and practice are related, how what we believe influence what we are and what we do. Doctrine is not simply a body of belief which one may accept with the mind but has a living dynamic character which has practical implications for our lives.

Let me illustrate by two modern examples, first of all Christology, and, secondly, social and political life. First, Christology. The Person of Christ is at the very heart of our Christian faith and what we believe about him is of central significance and has far-reaching consequences. Today this whole question is at the centre of the modern debate where the ways are very much divided. There are two main views that are put forward, the one represented by John Hick and others in the book 'The Myth of God Incarnate' and by Don Cupitt in his most recent works. 'The Myth of God Incarnate' argues that Jesus is simply a man who represents God to man and represents man before God and that the various titles and attributes to him in the New Testament are later accretions which come from the Greco-Roman world and are applied to Jesus.

These have to be discarded so that we can get back to a Jesus without myth, whose influence and example bring us close to God, are an inspiration and a challenge to us. It is assumed in this view that we already in a sense know who God is without Jesus. Now if this is true it will naturally have very real effects on how we live and on what we believe. We will no longer see in Jesus the Incarnate Son of God, redeeming, reconciling, a Lord and a Saviour. We will have no need of an atonement from sin. Received doctrines like the Trinity will go out of the window and mainstream Christianity will be discarded. C.F.D. Moule has called this the evolutionary view.⁴ This sees the picture of Jesus as evolving from that of a man to that of a man deified. Can one doubt that if this view prevailed the Church would become a very different one and the Christian life be impoverished, that in fact it would be a diluted or even a different faith with no real saving power?

Contrast with this the view which Moule calls the developmental,⁵ that is the view that the picture of Christ as we have it in the earliest traditions in the New Testament, was fragmentary and not fully developed. From this there developed the views more fully stated in later N.T. writings. The titles and metaphors that are applied to Jesus in the New Testament really reflect and really state who He is, that He is Lord and Son of God, that He is true man in an act of saving humiliation, bearing our sins, not just representing God to man or man to God, but being very God and very man for us men and for our salvation. Now this developmental view shows the N.T. traditions as growing in perception but not altering their basic view of Christ. This is the one which commended itself to the mind and thought of Church throughout the ages, and is I believe the correct teaching of the New Testament. This of course brings before us a quite different view of Jesus and of God, of man and of the world, a different reaction, a trust, an acknowledgement, a knowledge, a confession of one who is on the side of God and who comes to us from that side to bear our sins, to reconcile us to God, to bring us

into fellowship with him. This living faith in a crucified and risen Lord who is one with the Father, is very different from the one put forward by 'The Myth', is in fact quite opposed to it. It is this view that I believe we ought to espouse and support. Only on this basis has the Church a real message and a worthwhile future. Here what we believe does affect intimately the nature and quality of our lives.

The second question is that of the social and political realm and whether or not our doctrine taken from the New Testament is related to this at all and if so, how. Now there are three views that are canvassed today in this respect. One is that the Christian message being a purely spiritual and largely a personal one, has little or nothing to do with social and political life except perhaps very indirectly. As Christians believe in Christ, live a Christian life, show an example to others in that way, indirectly they influence society. This is true as far as it goes. Another view represented by Liberation Theology states that by commitment to the poor and oppressed and to their liberation, one meets with God; meeting human need, particularly the need of the oppressed as they are unjustly treated by sinful structures, by tyranny and so forth, is meeting with God, though of course not all liberationists would put it in as simple a form as this. But in certain forms of Liberation Theology at any rate this is the kind of salvation they believe the Bible teaches. Incidentally it is unfair to identify the ecumenical movement with this stance. A third view is that the Scriptures have a doctrine of Church and state, that there is a political and social thrust in the Scriptures that should not be ignored. The Church and the Christian see the political powers as part of God's purpose for man, an area where, whether known and acknowledged or not, God is sovereign and Jesus Christ is Lord. This is part of the Gospel, with the need to witness to this reality and dimension of the biblical revelation and to try to see how it should be worked and in practice. Moreover the prophetic message of the Scriptures underlines the Church's obligation to seek righteousness and justice in society and true peace on earth. The spiritual and liberationist

views are either wrong or very one-sided, and the third is the more biblical and proper one, as it has been indeed the traditional Reformed position. There is a doctrine of The Church and the powers that be, of Christian involvement in social and political life. There is a Christian view of the State and we cannot simply ignore it. This is not to say that the Church should interfere directly in politics by setting forth social and political programmes but it does mean that where moral, religious issues come up, the Church should have a voice. It also means that it has a view of the political realm in the will of God for man as an aspect of its teaching, its doctrine. Here again our doctrine derived from the Scriptures will have a very great influence on how we relate or if we relate at all to society, to the political life in which we find ourselves at any given moment.

It can be seen from these examples that what we believe about these important matters has both immediate and long-term effects for Christian life and practice. In theory the spiritual view has as a consequence that we regard this world as largely under Satan and not, as Calvin said, the theatrum gloriae Dei - the sphere where God's glory is shown forth. In practice it often means an uncritical conservative acceptance of the Powers that be. In the Liberationist view in theory the vertical dimension is diminished, the change of society is the main goal, this life is almost all and that to come means little. In practice it tends to align itself with revolutionary movements and fails to see in the powers that be any kind of divine ordinance.

As against these our tradition has rightly stressed a fuller Gospel because a more scriptural one which both believes in the need for personal conversion and radical change in relation to God in the fellowship of the Spirit and at the same time sees man's life in society and the political realm as under God's ordinance and rule and subject ultimately to his will. Such a view will have its own practical consequences for the Church since it will avoid the non-involvement of the 'spiritual' view and the too great or wrong involvement of the Liberationis

It will acknowledge Christ, his Lordship over all however differently this Lordship is expressed in the State and the Church.

So that we believe in these and many other areas influences what we in practice do today.

Christian doctrine is then an essential aspect of the Christian community's response to God's revelation in Christ attested in the Scriptures. Each facet of doctrine not only influences life but coheres with and influences other aspects of the faith as well. Now this is not a static but, as we have seen, a dynamic, living form of truth that penetrates and co-ordinates life as a whole and gives it unity and integrity. Doctrine yesterday attempted this total sweep and integration. the same task, in a very different setting, lies before us today.

Union Theological College,
Belfast.

John Thompson.

Notes:

1. John W. de Gruchy, The Role of Doctrine in the Church. Reformed World. Vol No. 1977 p.253
2. G.C. Berkouwer, The Second Vatican Council and the New Catholicism, Trs. Lewis B. Smedes, Michigan, W.B. Eerdmans, 1965, p.68.
3. Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics 1/2, p.658-69
4. C.F.D. Moule, The Origin of Christology, London: Cambridge University Press, 1977, pp.2ff
5. Ibid., p.2.

Although I have written several times on the subject of Matthew's Christology I cannot claim to be completely satisfied with my findings or, latterly, with my approach. The invitation to contribute an essay to this journal in honour of the memory of a gracious Christian gentleman and scholar provides me with yet another opportunity to consider this topic. The direction of my present thinking owes much to an observation by Birger Gerhardsson in his book The Mighty Acts of Jesus in Matthew (Lund, 1979): but of that I shall say more later

I

It is becoming increasingly clear to sensitive investigators of the New Testament documents that we are expecting, even demanding, that their authors give us a precision, coherence and consistency of view on this or that subject of enquiry which we have no right or precedent for requiring, unless we are dominated by a very stark theory of inspiration. For instance, it is expected that investigation of the letters of Paul will yield the apostle's understanding of the Law and that that understanding will be clear and utterly consistent. Now, given the fact that we do not know with certainty how many of the letters attributed to Paul are genuinely his, that the apostle wrote his letters over a period of roughly fifteen years, that he was writing sometimes on the defensive, sometimes on the offensive and sometimes in the interests of reconciling those who distrusted one another, that we do not really know what Paul said about the Law (or indeed almost anything else) when he proclaimed the gospel in the communities he founded or visited - in the light of these facts can we reasonably expect Paul's written words on the Law (even from the six or seven genuine letters) to provide us with a neat, coherent and entirely consistent view of the place and purpose of the Law in the divine economy for the salvation of Jews and Gentiles post Christum? Of even the most careful systematic theologians in the twentieth century we would not expect that kind of precision and consistency: it is unreasonable to expect it of an evangelist and community-builder who had to cope with misunderstanding, misrepresentation by opponents,

and the very varying circumstances and composition of the churches to which he was writing, to say nothing about the inherent difficulties of the issue for a Jew who had become a Christian. There is therefore nothing whatsoever extraordinary in seeing what is almost a cynical view of Law expressed in Galatians altered to a much more balanced, mature and reflective view of Law in Romans. (Is Paul not to be allowed to alter his emphasis, or change his mind by a fraction?) To demand consistency and coherence is to demand what we would like to find, but, in my view, will not find nor should expect to find.

But it will be said that this is an isolated example because of its peculiar intricacy. That is not so. Ask an even more important question: What is Paul's Christology? Is there a single answer? Of titles used, "Messiah (Christ)" is insufficient. Will "Kyrios" sum it all up? What then of "Son of God", and "Wisdom", and "Second or Last Adam"? And what about those passages which present Jesus as saviour, reconciler, intercessor, and so forth? Is Paul's Christology a sort of pot-pourri, or are we asking the wrong kind of question, or going the wrong way about finding an answer?

Turning now to Matthew's Gospel - and I think it would be true of the other Gospels also - the situation is similar. Considering that the Gospel contains some authentic Jesus-material, passages which may be called "traditional", and the redaction from a theologically-oriented author, it is not very surprising to discover that it is extremely difficult to put together a coherent and consistent Matthean view on the Law and on the mission to the Gentiles. The problem of explaining the presence and purpose in one Gospel of Matt. 10.5-6/ 15.24 on the one hand, and 28.16-20 on the other, is well known. It is not insoluble, but it should make serious readers of the Gospel aware that the questions we put to that Gospel may not always (or even often) receive a clear, coherent and univocal answer. And so to my topic: Matthean Christology. The quest for the Christologies of the Synoptic evangelists has been dominated by the

investigation of the meaning and function of titles such as Lord, Son of God, Son of Man, etc. Probably the most comprehensive recent study of Matthean Christology on these lines is in the work of J.D. Kingsbury. Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom.¹ In this book the author examines each of the major titles in Matthew and attempts to establish some hierarchy and inter-relationship among them. As is well known, he claims that the pre-eminent title in Matthew's Christology is "Son of God": this is the one title which occurs in every major section of the Gospel and correlates with essential features of Matthew's overall theology. I have no wish to rehearse here his arguments for that view, nor my critical reaction to it, but I still find myself asking the question, "Why must one title be deemed 'pre-eminent', 'most exalted', 'foremost'?"² Lately, Professor Kingsbury by using the approach of a 'narrative-reading' of the Matthean story has confirmed, to his own satisfaction, the rightness of his earlier view.³ ('Son of God' is God's evaluative point of view of Jesus in Matthew, and in Mark too, and therefore obviously pre-eminent.) Again I have criticised this work: Kingsbury has replied,⁵ and we seem to be at an impasse. Why? Possibly because of the continued concentration on the attempt to make one Christological title in Matthew pre-eminent. Other writers and commentators on Matthew have claimed that his most important Christological title is "Kyrios", or "Son of David", or "Son of God" and "Son of man" together. All these suggestions cannot be correct nor can they all be said to be wrong. And if each title makes a contribution to Matthew's Christology, that Christology, with such a range of contributing titles, cannot be pre-eminentely expressed by any one of them, for that would be to say less than Matthew wants to say and has said. There seems to be a fault somewhere: either in the method of approaching the issue or in the conclusions derived, or both.

Another aspect of Matthew's Christology that continues to have some appeal is his use of Wisdom motifs. This was interestingly developed by M.J. Suggs in his small but important book, Wisdom, Christology and Law in

in Matthew's Gospel (1970)⁶: there he claims that, whereas in Q Jesus would have been presented as one of Wisdom's rejected envoys, Matthew (at least in certain texts such as 11.2-19 and 11.25-30) advances upon this and presents Jesus as the personified Wisdom of God - a quite crucial step in the development of New Testament Christology. Although the hypothesis has some quite serious weaknesses (cf. M.D. Johnston, "Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology", CBQ, vol.36, 1974, pp.44-64) it still merits (and will continue to merit) attention. For instance, in The Testament of Jesus-Sophia⁷ Fred W. Burnett presses on with some of the issues raised but not addressed by Suggs' pioneering study. Burnett claims that Matthew's entire eschatological discourse (24.3-31) can be understood in terms of Jesus' (i.e. Wisdom's) final testament to the disciples (Wisdom's emissaries) after the rejection by Israel (chap.23). So far, however, the influence of Wisdom metaphors on Matthew's Christology cannot be deemed to be large or obvious.

II

The dominant presence of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7) and the other great discourses of the Gospel, plus the Gospel's concern with Jesus as interpreter of the law, leaves little doubt that Matthew presents Jesus as the definitive teacher. One recalls that the disciples are reminded that there is only one Teacher and one Master, Jesus himself (23.8-10), and the post-Easter Jesus charges the disciples in their commissioning to bring all nations into obedience to "all that I have commanded you". Less obvious perhaps is the fact that Matthew also lays great emphasis on Jesus' role as healer. The Matthean redaction of the miracle stories, especially those in chapters 8 and 9, was brilliantly explored by H.J. Held in "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories". By abbreviating Mark's stories (cf. Mark 5. 1.20 with Matt.8.28-34) in order to highlight what Jesus says, the miracle stories become, in Matthew's hands, rather like pronouncement stories and their renarration made a means of providing instruction on Christology,

discipleship and faith. However, the contribution that the stories make to accepted Christological categories is quite small, except in one respect: by inserting fulfilment citations from Isa. 53.4 at 8.17 and from Isa. 42.1-4 at 12.18-21 - both in relation to Jesus' healing activity - Matthew, in my view, deliberately casts Jesus as healer in the role of the Servant of Yahweh.

And now to Birger Gerhardsson's⁸ book, The Mighty Acts of Jesus according to Matthew. This book examines the full range of miracles or dunamis in the Gospel, not just the collection in chapters 8 and 9, but other stories and summaries of Jesus' deeds recorded throughout Matthew's book. Gerhardsson makes a distinction between (a) 'therapeutic' stories, such as the healings which are generally performed at the request or demand of a sick person, are scattered throughout the record of Jesus' ministry and are directed to people or individuals outside the disciple-group; and (b) 'non-therapeutic' miracles (e.g. the stilling of the storm and the walking on the water) which, by contrast, are more occasional, are not mentioned in the summaries of Jesus' activities ("preaching, teaching, healing"), are done at Jesus' invitation and are performed exclusively for disciples. Professor Gerhardsson concludes from this that the non-therapeutic miracle stories have more problematic historical basis and are probably to be located within the Christological reflection of the early Church. Others have, of course, made similar observations and suggestions.

For our purposes it is more important to note Gerhardsson's stress on the importance of the stories of and references to Jesus' miracles for Matthew's Christology. The Gospel uses this material to portray Jesus' "incomparable exousia (authority) as 'the healer of Israel'" (p.93). Rather than a Christology subsumed under and dominated by the "Son of God" designation (as Kingsbury claims) Gerhardsson believes that Matthew's Christology was "many-faceted", a portrayal of Jesus "illustrated with many kinds of material" (p.82). Many titles appear in

connection with the mighty acts of Jesus in Matthew: "Son of Man", "Christ", "Son of David", "Lord", but not "Son of God". Although Gerhardsson agrees with Kingsbury in claiming that "Son of God" is Matthew's most prominent designation for Jesus, he goes on to suggest (and I would certainly agree) that the theme of Jesus as "Servant" is not submerged by the "Son" title, but in fact qualifies Jesus' role as "Son of God". He is "Son of God" precisely in that he is humble, obedient and serving. The fact that the Servant of Yahweh texts are applied to healing stories (8.17 and 12.18ff), whereas the Son title is not, implies that the therapeutic activity brings out a dimension of Matthew's Christology which the exalted "Son of God" title does not. In fact - and this is the very important observation by Gerhardsson to which I referred at the beginning of this essay - none of the titles is essential to the miracle stories: the narratives themselves present Christology by showing Jesus' in action.

That significant comment about the miracle stories is, I think, capable of extension. Matthew's whole book, his Gospel, is a narrative, a story (if you like), or a 'preaching' in which Old Testament reflection, vignettes of Jesus acting in word and deed and Christological titles from the emerging tradition are all blended to convey the evangelist's experience of Jesus' presence and meaning within the community. Because he portrays Jesus by means of a story no one category - teacher, healer, Wisdom incarnate, triumphant Son of man, not even Kyrios or Son of God - is adequate to contain that Jesus revered by the Church, the Jesus on whom Matthew reflects in his book.

In his important book The Identity of Jesus Christ⁹ Hans W. Frei argues (if I understand him correctly) that the Gospel narratives render or proffer the identity of Jesus by means of their description of him. He is who he truly and universally is in these narratives which record the intention-action sequence of his life and his self-manifestation in the passion. In other words, the Christology is in the whole story and therefore carried in the activity of Jesus as narrated. For example, Jesus

never says in Matthew (nor in any other Gospel for that matter) "I am the Son of man", but "The Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again". A question of identity is turned into an answer of activity. Likewise, the questions "Are you the King of the Jews?" (Matt.27.11) and "Are you the Christ, the Son of God?" (26.63) are not answered with a clear affirmative (for "the words are yours" is at most a very reluctant way of expressing assent), but in terms of what is or will be going on. What I wish to suggest is that the search after the meaning of titles in order to arrive at Matthew's Christology may be a somewhat mistaken approach to the matter. I am not sure that we can say, on the evidence available, that Matthew had a neat, precise, easily definable position on Christology. If we had him at hand to ask, 'Did, or do you think Jesus is Son of God?' he would say 'Yes': 'Son of Man?', 'Yes', and Lord and Messiah and Shepherd of Israel, and even perhaps new Moses. He does not compose or compile his traditions in the interests of advancing any one or even all of these titles: he wrote a narrative which commences with a birth-story and ends with a great commissioning scene, both of which are distinctive to his work. What they affirm - that in Jesus God was and is with his people for good and for ever: Emmanuel, God with us / I am with you always.... - is confirmed in all that lies between, which Matthew summarises by "teaching, preaching, healing". As Jesus instructs on the behaviour of disciples appropriate to Kingdom-style living and on the intensification of Torah in the double love-commandment: as he proclaims the Kingdom in parables, through which, as through a kaleidoscope, we see the varied, enigmatic, puzzling pictures of what life is or can be like when God is acknowledged and experienced as sovereign in majesty and mercy: as he heals the sick, overcomes prejudice against the outcasts and the marginalised in their society: as he endures the death which miraculously - in God's hands - leads to deathless life - in all this, Jesus is God with his people, and it takes the entire story, the whole narrative to convey that view of Jesus' identity (Christology), and it is

one which is rich, powerful and immediate.

NOTES:

1. Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom (SPCK, London), 1976.
2. D. Hill, "Son and Servant: An Essay on Matthean Christology", JSNT 6 (1980) 2-16.
3. J.D. Kingsbury, "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Literary-Critical Probe", JSNT 24, (1984), 3-36.
4. D. Hill, "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Rejoinder to Professor Kingsbury's Literary-Critical Probe", JSNT 21 (1984), 37-52.
5. J.D. Kingsbury, "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Rejoinder to David Hill", JSNT 25 (1985) 61-81.
6. Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel, (Harvard Press, Cambridge, Mass.) 1970.
7. F.W. Burnett, The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew, (University Press of America, Washington) 1981.
8. B. Gerhardsson, The Mighty Acts of Jesus according to Matthew (CWK, Gleerup, Lund) 1979.
9. H.W. Frei, The Identity of Jesus Christ, (Fortress Press, Philadelphia) 1975.

In 1603 James VI of Scotland became also King James I of England. He believed his two kingdoms could be more easily managed if the Church of Scotland and the Church of England had the same form of government. The English bishops seemed to him to be in a position to ensure that the preaching and practice of the clergy encouraged civil obedience and thus assisted national stability. Therefore he sought to restore the same system in the Church of Scotland.

The Church of Scotland had undergone a major reformation in 1560 when the old episcopal system was shattered. John Knox and his associates had to reorganise the Church and their plan was set forth in the First Book of Discipline. Its aim was to provide ministers for the parishes of Scotland. Ten of these ministers would be chosen to be superintendents responsible for placing ministers in parishes and seeing that they did their duty and received a sufficient stipend. Only five superintendents were ever appointed. Two or three of the bishops of the old order were not unwilling to assist in the reorganisation. However, there was no thought of maintaining a continuity from the pre-Reformation episcopate. Both superintendents and co-operating bishops were under the control of the General Assembly and were never dominating figures in its deliberations.

Under the leadership of Andrew Melville the move from episcopal government was accelerated and a thorough presbyterian system was set forth in the Second Book of Discipline.² By 1592 this had been adopted as the pattern of government of the Kirk. However, the Regent Morton and the young King James maintained the framework of the old system; they chose titular bishops who would sit in Parliament and draw the revenues of the ancient sees, but the bulk of these revenues would be siphoned off to landowners who kept these spectral bishops under their control. These bishops were not consecrated and were not regarded as bishops by the Church of England; they had thus little status in either Scotland or England. Archbishop James Boyd of Glasgow was indeed sufficiently respected to be chosen as Moderator of the General Assembly in 1574 but he had no effective archiepiscopal jurisdiction.

When James became King of England he set about bringing this shadowy episcopal structure into accord with the English system, and after heavy pressure he succeeded in having three Scottish bishops consecrated in London in 1610 according to the form of the Church of England. They returned to Scotland and consecrated other bishops and thus provided bishops for the whole of Scotland. Bishops now presided at ordinations and in the church courts but they acted with restraint and made no move to require those who had been ordained by presbytery to submit to episcopal ordination;³ nor did they at first attempt to impose conformity to forms of worship similar to those in use in the Church of England.

It was in this period of transition that Samuel Rutherford was growing up. He was born in Roxburghshire in 1600 and went to school in Jedburgh and then to the University of Edinburgh where he graduated in 1621. He was a distinguished student and he read and assimilated the works of patristic, medieval and reformation writers and he had an extensive knowledge of the writings of Roman Catholic apologists and especially

of the writing of the Jesuits. In his later controversial writings he always marshalled a formidable array of authorities. His academic success was followed by an appointment to be a regent to teach Latin in the University. However, a serious moral lapse led to his resignation but he made amends by marrying the woman he had wronged and he was devoted to her during the later long illness which led to her early death. His whole life was changed and he became a man of intense dedication to Christ. In 1627 he was presented to the parish of Anwoth which lies on the way between Stranraer and Dumfries. Though the extant records do not mention his ordination it is likely that Andrew Lamb who became Bishop of Galloway in 1619 took part in his admission to the parish. Rutherford seems already to have had a distaste for the episcopal system and this became one of the burning convictions of his life but in 1627 he was still able to conform sufficiently to enable him to become a parish minister. Like some Scottish licentiates in Ireland he may have thought that the presence of other ministers along with the bishop at the ordination made the occasion a presbytery ordination while the bishop assumed he was conducting an episcopal ordination.⁵

King James had begun to aggravate the situation by compelling a General Assembly in Perth in 1618 to enact Five Articles requiring that the Sacrament be received kneeling, that the Sacrament could be administered privately to the sick, that Baptism could be administered in private houses in cases of necessity, that children should be confirmed by the bishop at the age of eight, and that the five main Christian festivals should be duly observed.⁴ Bishop Lamb did not make a close inquisition into the extent to which these articles were obeyed and so confrontation was avoided in most parishes but the articles were much resented by ministers and people. Rutherford shared that resentment and said that these requirements had been necessary they would have been specified in the New Testament, but Christ did not 'burden his churches with such dumb and toothless mysteries'.⁵ Rutherford did not hide his opposition to the office of bishop or to the increasingly rigid policy of the Scottish bishops and this naturally estranged him from his own bishop who vetoed a proposal that Rutherford be translated to the larger parish of Kirkcudbright.⁶ In 1636 Lamb was succeeded by Thomas Sydeserf, a much firmer disciplinarian, and Rutherford now made even sharper criticisms of episcopacy. This led to his appearance before the Scottish Court of High Commission; he said the bishops imposed conformity and would have us 'digest it contrary to our stomachs' and would use the weapon of deprivation to 'convert us to the ceremonial faith'.⁷ He was sentenced to be banished from Anwoth and sent to Aberdeen.⁸

This was a severe restraint. Although he was not kept in close confinement he was frowned upon by Dr. Barron, the Professor of Divinity in Marischal College, and by other Aberdeen ministers who did not share his outlook. He was prevented from preaching and this was for him a great deprivation as he had proved to be an influential preacher in Anwoth where many came long distances to hear him. Many had also sought his counsel on their problems and on the way of salvation. He was now bereft of what, he said, was his only joy, 'the poor man's one ewe that had no more'; 'my dumb sabbaths' are festering wounds'. To some extent he found redress through his correspondence and for the two years of his banishment he wrote to many in Galloway and especially to high-born la-

of his acquaintance. His letters, especially those from this period had a wide influence and after being collated and published in later times they gained a lasting place in the literature of spiritual counsel. Some have even gone to the length of putting them alongside Augustine's Confessions and a Kempis's Imitation of Christ. Alexander Whyte said there was 'sweetness and strength and ecstasy⁹ enough for ten men in any one of Rutherford's inebriated letters'. They still have readers and they bear resemblance to medieval mystical writings¹⁰ with their thought woven around the imagery of the Song of Solomon. Rutherford indulges in rapturous sensual language and luxuriates in the thought of the believer being ravished by the loving Saviour and much of his thought could be summed up in the imagery of the hymn, 'Safe in the arms of Jesus', a hymn now generally out of favour and also out of tune with the robust call of the New Testament to be mature in understanding and ready for resolute wrestling with the baffling decisions which have to be made in daily life. One of his correspondents was Lady Kenmure, the sister of the Marquis of Argyll; her coarse and cruel husband had recently died and this was a great relief to her, and Rutherford assured her she was now free to be the bride of Christ, the bride of 'that soul-delighting lovely bridegroom, your sweet, sweet Jesus'. Even more effusive messages strew the letters and they tend to pall and repel, but at other times the letters reveal a man of strong convictions and sturdy faith. 'The Lord liveth; trust in him, although he slay you; faith is exceeding charitable and believeth no evil of God'; thus he wrote to one lady, and he also told Lady Kenmure to 'be content to wade through the waters betwixt you and glory with him, holding fast his hand, for he knoweth all the fords'.¹²

The letters also reveal the serenity with which he faced his own trials in Aberdeen 'I know Christ shall make Aberdeen my garden of delights'. 'Christ hath so handsomely fitted for my shoulders this rough tree of the cross as it hurteth no ways'. 'Grace tried is better than grace and it is more than grace: it is glory in its infancy'.¹³ Yet, the trials were severe; writing to Marion McNaught, a niece of Lord Kenmure, he said, 'My life is bitter unto me, and I fear the Lord be my contrair party... It is hard to keep sight of God in a storm, especially when he hides himself for the trial of his children'.¹⁴ Writing to Lady Kenmure, he asked, 'When authority, king, court and churchmen oppose the truth, what other armour have we but prayer and faith?'¹⁵

Rutherford's resentment against the policies of the authorities in Church and State were shared by many Scots and came to the boil in 1637 when a new Service Book modelled on the English Book of Common Prayer was produced and ordered to be used in all the parishes of the land. This led to violent protests in St. Giles' Cathedral and elsewhere and then to the signing of the National Covenant in 1638. This Covenant was widely approved and was the expression of a national resentment against English attempts to remould the Scottish Church; it rejected the Service Book and vowed to resist any further innovations made without the consent of Parliament and the General Assembly.

During this time of turmoil Rutherford slipped away from Aberdeen and made his way back to Anwoth. The presbytery of Kirkcudbright appointed him to be one of its commissioners to the General Assembly in Glasgow in November 1638. This was the famous Assembly which swept away episcopacy,

the Service Book, the Book of Canons and the Five Articles of Perth, and it also appointed Rutherford to be the Professor of Divinity at St. Mary's College in St. Andrews. Very reluctantly and against the wishes of the people of Anwoth he accepted the appointment but his new position gave him a platform from which to voice his opposition to the offending forms and ceremonies. He now sympathized with those who took their aversion to such forms far further than had been common in Scotland. He approved their excision of the Gloria and the Lord's Prayer from public worship and thus helped on its way a trend which for generations cut the Scottish Church off from much of the heritage of Christian worship.¹⁶ His advocacy of presbyterian church government took strident form in his Plea for Presbytery published in 1642 and this was followed by other verbose and learned treatises making exclusive claims for presbytery as the only tolerable form of church government and also abusing in rancorous language all other forms.

The upheaval in the General Assembly led to war with the King who was also at loggerheads with his English Parliament. The Scots now found a common interest with the English Parliament in opposing the King and this led to the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant in 1643 by which, in return for Scottish military aid, the English Parliament covenanted to reform the Church of England so that there might be a common structure of the Church throughout Britain. The reform was to be in a form agreeable to the Word of God and the Scots assumed this would prove to be presbyterian but the definition of what was agreeable to the Word of God proved to a matter of acute debate.

The details of the reform were to be worked out by an Assembly of Divines at Westminster to which the Scots would send commissioners. Three elders and five ministers were sent to the Assembly and Rutherford was one of the ministers. He was not eager to go and he said he would have been content to be 'a common barrowman at Anwoth' and not a mason laying the foundations of a reform to last for many generations and building 'the waste places of Zion in another kingdom' and having 'a hand or finger in that carved work on the cedar and almug trees in that new temple'.¹⁷ Nevertheless, he went to the Assembly and was a strong supporter of the Covenant. Like John Knox, he was no defender of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings and he made his position clear in Lex Rex: The Law and the Prince. In that work he challenged the policy of Charles I and asked for 'a warrant in nature's law or in God's Word' for submitting to a regime which imperilled Protestantism in England, Scotland and Ireland.¹⁸ God gave to kings no unlimited power to act above the law and people had a right of 'self-preservation';¹⁹ there was no ordinance of God against 'defending our own life against tyrannical power'.²⁰ Rutherford based this claim on the principle that while kings reign by the authority of God that authority is transmitted through the people who have the right to recall that authority if the king betrays the trust reposed in him.²¹ Though Samuel picked out and anointed both Saul and David it was the people who made them kings; God inclined them to choose but this implies that it was they who made the choice.²² Rutherford claimed that Charles I had misused his power and though he had done so by following the advice of 'deluded counsellors' he had no transcendent and boundless power to make a law contrary to the law.²³

It was in this mood that Rutherford went to the Assembly. The Assembly plodded on its way for over four years and the Scots did not find its work as constructive as they had hoped.²⁴ Rutherford wrote: 'There is nothing here but divisions in the Church and Assembly, for beside the Brownists and Independents (who, of all that differ from us, come nearest to walkers with God) there are many other sects here of Anabaptists, Libertines - who are for all opinions in religion - fleshly and abominable Antinomians, and Seekers who are for no Church ordinances but expect apostles to come to reform churches, and a world of others, all against the government of presbyters'. He found the discussion of church government both important and wearisome and he hoped for an early conclusion so that he might be 'delivered from this prison'.²⁵ Two months later he said they were still 'debating with much contention of disputes for the just measures of the Lord's temple' and 'even gracious men (so I conceive them) do not a little hinder the work'; Independents were 'mighty opposites to presbyterial government'. Though the Scottish commissioners had persisted in pushing through 'some propositions for the Scripture right of presbytery' and had proved that single congregations had not the right to ordain pastors or to excommunicate members this had been done in the face of heavy opposition: 'for my part, I often despair of the reformation of this land'.²⁶ He admitted there were some zealous, learned and faithful ministers in the Assembly and many sound Christians in London, but he had not come across them any more easily 'than if I were in Spain', and, as for the House of Lords, they are 'rotten men and hate our commissioners and our cause'. There were some who thought 'the land is near a deliverance, but I rather desire it than believe it'.²⁷

He poured out his objections to the Independent position in his Due Right of Presbyteries, a long and repetitive work which he produced in 1644 while he was at the Assembly. He maintained there was a catholic and visible Church inclusive of many local congregations. Elders had 'the keys of the kingdom' and had authority from Christ to order the affairs of the Church. By elders he meant primarily the pastors who were bishops in the New Testament sense, but ruling elders were associated with them in presbyteries. When they met in ecumenical councils or in presbyteries the Holy Spirit was present and they had divine authorization to decide doctrinal matters and to discipline, and, if need be, excommunicate members of the Church, and, on proof of repentance, restore them to membership. Autonomous local churches, as found in New England and as described by John Robinson, the chaplain to the Pilgrim Fathers, were not churches in the New Testament sense and they had no right to ordain their own ministers if they wished to be faithful to New Testament guidance. The wider Church had to be involved since 'the established and settled order of calling of pastors is by succession of pastors to pastors'. This had been maintained through the centuries, even under the papacy: 'though Luther and Zwingli had their whole calling from the Pope and his clergy, yet think we not that calling no calling, but that it hath that which essentially constituteth a minister'.²⁸ Rutherford was one of the few Scottish leaders of his time who spelt out so clearly a doctrine of ministerial succession from apostolic times.

All the efforts of the Assembly seemed to be wasted as Cromwell rose to power and crushed any hope of imposing a national presbyterian system or

of forcing all citizens to conform to it. In Scottish eyes the Covenant was being betrayed and the Scots were further disturbed by the treatment meted out to their king who was in the custody of the English army. Some Scots entered into an Engagement with the king whereby in return for support in regaining his authority he would subscribe to the Covenant and give Presbyterianism a three-year trial in England. Other Scots, including Rutherford, did not trust the king's word and the General Assembly gave no support to the Engagement. However, an army of Engagers, led by the Marquis of Hamilton, invaded England, but it was ill-prepared and was easily crushed by Cromwell at Preston in 1648. The English Parliament was now dominated by Cromwell and it decided to eliminate the king as a possible focus of rebellion; he was executed in 1649.

This further angered the Scots and they invited his son who had been proclaimed in Holland as Charles II to come to Scotland. He arrived and was widely welcomed. During his stay he visited St. Andrews and listened to a Latin oration on the duty of kings. This was delivered by Rutherford who was now the Rector of the University, having turned down two offers of a professorship on the continent. The welcome given to Charles was a challenge to England, and Cromwell lost no time in leading an army into Scotland where he defeated a Covenanting army at Dunbar on 3 September 1650. The Scots regrouped further north and Charles was crowned at Scone in 1651. Many of the Scots now felt that the issue was no longer the defence of the Covenant but was a struggle for national survival and any Scot who was willing to fight for his country should be enlisted in the army whether or not he had taken the Covenant. This caused a rift among the Scots. Those who were resolved to see the issue as a national struggle were the large majority and are known as Resolutioners. The minority of Protesters held that an army fighting for the high principle of the Covenant had good right to expect far more divine support than could a motley array of all citizens. Rutherford was a leading Protester but he was the only member of the presbytery of St. Andrews to make a public declaration to that effect. The Resolutioners raised an army and invaded England in an attempt to regain the English throne for their king but they were defeated by Cromwell at the battle of Worcester on 3 September 1651. Cromwell regarded this as God's crowning mercy and it was followed by the flight of the king and by the conquest of Scotland by General Monk.

Cromwell set about reorganizing the Church of England. He planned to establish a system wherein there would be room for ministers of good repute and preaching ability regardless of their denominational allegiance. A company of Approvers allocated men of wide diversity of outlook to the pulpits of England and Wales; Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists passed through the approving filter, as did hundreds of episcopal clergy who managed to be allowed to stay in their parishes. Eventually a similar method was applied to Scotland where its main effect was that ministers were allowed to remain in their parishes and preach to any who freely resorted unto them. Independent ministers were free to preach and to gather congregations of people who were willing to follow them.

Rutherford was angry with those ministers who held on to their parishes 'for the sake of maintenance upon the land'; he also scorned 'the

promiscuous generality' who supported these ministers as they had supported 'the prelatic conformists' in the past. Rutherford noted that these ministers declaimed in pulpits and presbyteries against him and his supporters as 'implacable and separatists'.²⁹

This system with its inbuilt permission of variety of forms of government and worship was obnoxious to Rutherford who held there was 'a perfect platform of discipline' laid down in the Bible and it ought to be imposed by Church and State upon all citizens; all should be brought forcibly if necessary, within the sound of the Gospel message. He set out his position in A Free Disputation against pretended Liberty of Conscience, published in 1649. This is perhaps the sternest of all his writings. He admitted that conscience was indeed like 'a chip and a beam of God' but it was so polluted that it could not be a reliable guide. God, however, had provided guidance in his Word and there was no need to rely on conscience. When the Church assembled in council and, after deliberation on the scriptural position, came to a decision on a matter of doctrine or practice, that was a definition binding on all. In a country with a Christian magistrate all citizens ought to be required to assent to the decision, but even in a country where the magistrate was not a Christian it could properly be expected that rules on outward behaviour should be enforced; for example, compulsory attendance at church might not be worship of God but it was good for society.³⁰ Rutherford rejected the right to dissent; those who claimed that right made a god of their conscience, and to deify conscience was to leave people at the mercy of fallible opinions and lead to scepticism, 'sailing about the coasts of truth all our life and dying in no belief at all'.³¹ He denied that this was to claim for the Church what had been claimed for the Church of Rome and which had been the basis of that Church's abuses and tyranny. In his view, the Church as he defined it and the truth which it proclaimed were not tainted with the arrogance of Rome. He also dismissed the argument of Jeremy Taylor in his Liberty of Prophesying that Scripture at many points was not sufficiently explicit to produce doctrinal definitions which could be imposed upon all. Moreover, according to Taylor, the knowledge and presuppositions of commentators and of church councils were not so correct and balanced as to produce infallible doctrinal statements. Rutherford replied that the earthen Church was indeed fallible but, being organized as the New Testament prescribed, it contained precious jewels and had been promised guidance to 'determine infallible points'.³² He admitted that some doctrines were more fundamental than others and that a person was a true Christian if he could simply say he believed in Christ even if he was ignorant of other doctrines, but this was no reason for allowing dissent from these other doctrines. If a 'brotherly indulgence' was accorded to varying views this would 'suffer millions to perish through silence and merciless complacency'.³³ It could also lead to schism and this would be intolerable. Paul had not countenanced the setting up of rival churches in Corinth. Truth could be known; heresy could be detected,³⁴ and the persistent dissenter was perverse and not heroic.

Under effective enforced conformity there could be no gathered church of only proved believers; there could be no sifting of the wheat from the tares to secure a pure church. This troubled many preachers whose sermons included pleas for a free decision but Rutherford does not seem to have been so troubled. He opposed any attempt to sift the wheat from

from the tares. Any exclusion of 'non- converts' would only leave them open to the lures of 'seminary priests' and others who were trying to win adherents in Scotland.³⁵ If they were not forced to hear the Gospel they would be left to 'embrace what religion is most suitable to corrupt nature'. He said it was not scriptural to 'excommunicate from the visible Church (which is the office-house of the free grace of Christ and his draw-net) all the multitudes of non-converts, baptized and visibly within the covenant of grace, which are in Great Britain and all the reformed churches and so shut the gates of the Lord's gracious calling upon all these (because they are not in your judgement chosen to salvation) when once you are within yourselves'.³⁶ 'This is downright Anabaptism that no visible churches are on earth but such as consist of real saints only'.³⁷ How could the kingdoms of the world become the kingdom of Christ' if you number infants (as many do) and all such as your charity cannot judge converts (as others do) among heathens and pagans who have not a visible claim or interest in Christ? The candlestick is not yours nor the house'. Rutherford looked upon the obligatory and inclusive 'visible church, though black and spotted, as the hospital and guest-house of sick, halt, maimed, withered over which Christ is Lord, Physician and Master, and we would wait upon those that are not yet in Christ, as our Lord waited upon us and you both'.³⁸

This emphasis upon an inclusive Church lies uneasily alongside other passages where Rutherford deals at length with the Church's right to excommunicate, but both emphases arose out of his own experience. The emphasis upon an inclusive Church arose in reaction to the attitude of some ministers who had been ejected for their nonconformity in their Irish parishes and then returned to Scotland and favoured the setting up of gathered conventicles,³⁹ and the emphasis upon the Church's right of excommunication arose in reaction to the Erastians in the Westminster Assembly who insisted that the civil magistrate should be involved in any decision to excommunicate.⁴⁰

Rutherford's experiences in the Westminster Assembly stiffened his position on almost every issue of polity and theology and this came out in all his treatises. He was not unaware of his combative nature: 'My mother hath borne me a man of contention and one that striveth with the whole earth';⁴¹ 'I have a fire within me; I defy all the⁴² devils in hell and all the prelates in Scotland to cast water upon it'. Even one of his finest works with the seemingly straightforward title, The Trial and Triumph of Faith, was strewn with sharp attacks upon any deviations from what he regarded as the self-evident truth of the Gospel. In this work he rhapsodizes upon the grace of Christ who 'stoops so low as to take to himself man's will, to stoop⁴³ to God and law'; 'Oh, so little and low as great Jesus Christ is!'. The gift of grace is the faith which is not 'a flower that groweth out of such sour and cold ground as nature; it is a stem and birth of heaven'.⁴⁴ The incarnation of Christ was an incalculable grace; it alone could break the stony heart which contains a stony will: 'There is no goodness in our will now but what it hath from grace' and where grace is⁴⁵ 'it cannot be bid'; 'grace, first and last, was all our happiness'.

Rutherford then moves on to link the gift of grace to the doctrine of election. God's gracious favour is only given to those whom he chooses to receive it. None can know in advance if they are among the chosen nor can they cause the winds of grace to blow but they may pray for the

gifts of grace; such prayers will need to be more vehement and urgent than printed prayers which, in his view, 'must be toothless and spiritless talk'.⁴⁶ Rutherford takes the view that Christ does not claim one in a hundred; he may pick one out of a family and leave the rest to the devil: 'there be many common stones, not many pearls'.⁴⁷ 'He offereth life to all, so they believe', yet he 'intendeth to bestow life on a few only'. However, even with this dark prospect, none need be so disheartened 'as they are to believe their own impossibility to be saved'.⁴⁸ Furthermore, even when God gives grace and calls a person to believe, the way is hazardous: 'Saints go to heaven halting and carrying their bolts and fetters in indwelling sin through the field of free grace, even to the gates of glory, Christ daily washing and renewing pardons, we daily defiling, to the end that grace may be grace'. Sin still has house-room in the believer,⁴⁹ but its power is broken, and 'God takes time to perfect his saints'. Moreover, there are great differences between believers; 'grace worketh suitable to the nature of the patients' and there are 'renewed acts of free grace on the way'. There are 'children and dogs in our Father's house, yet dogs which the Lord of the house owneth'; some get bread from the high table, while others are under the table 'waiting to receive the little drops of the great honeycomb of rich grace that falleth from him'.⁵⁰

In this book Rutherford wrestles with the truth contained in the assertion that Christ died for our sins. He says that only the work of Christ as our Mediator could remedy our sinful condition. All have done evil and are under God's condemnation but Christ has become our⁵¹ surety; he was made sin itself and we are made righteousness in him. Rutherford is troubled by this claim. He insists that Christ never became a sinner as we are sinners; he was never a thief or a false witness and yet he took upon him the sins of the thief and the false witness. Christ did not commit the sins which were done by those whom he redeemed and they were still the persons who had committed the sins: 'There was no fundamental guilt nor any bad deserving in Christ'.⁵² Paul in the letter to the Galatians said Christ 'became a curse for us' but 'God is never said to hate his Son, Jesus Christ, as he doth hate sin'.⁵³ Rutherford concludes that what Christ has done was to 'bear the debt and punishment due to sinners: 'My friend and surety hath done all and paid all for me and that is as good, in the court of justice, as if I had paid in my own person all'. Christ relieves the believer of the punishment and condemnation due to sin, but⁵⁴ sin itself has to be removed by sanctification and by degrees.

Rutherford himself found the way of sanctification a rough and uphill road and he was probably uneasy at times because of the tensions within his own mind. Much of what he advocated proved unpalatable even in his own age when it was usual to have firm beliefs and strong opinions. His advocacy of his form of Presbyterianism as the only possible scriptural form of church government proved to be unacceptable to most of his presbyterian contemporaries in Scotland and his demand for its forcible imposition upon all the people of Britain without regard for any dissent on grounds of conscience met with a cool response from those who found justification for Protestantism in the conscientious rejection of the abuses which had marred the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome. His rejection of the public use of the Lord's Prayer

and of the Church's prayers was a great impoverishment of worship. A man of sanctity as he was often seen to be in his writings and by wide repute, he could also sink to repellent arrogance and bitter intolerance which could see no virtue in positions other than his own. His inflexibility, especially on his exposition of the central doctrines of the incarnation and of redemption, is still much esteemed by those who are drawn to him as their mentor. It can also repel, as it repelled Dr. Helen Waddell when she read The Trial and Triumph of Faith.⁵⁵

Rutherford and the other Protesters were a minority in the 1650's. They were distressed by the policy imposed by the Cromwell regime and also dismayed by the readiness of so many to accommodate themselves to that situation, and they were unable to arouse any fervent opposition to the government. Their successors under Charles II and James VII became the heroic remnant of Covenanters which endured great hardships in 'the Killing Time' and whose faithfulness, sometimes unto death, is held in honoured memory by the Scots. The accession of William of Orange came as a great relief but his insistence upon a measure of toleration was a great disappointment to the Covenanters. Most Scots were content in the end to accept the new arrangement which was not overthrown by the efforts of either the Old or the Young Pretender. The toleration made possible the later secessions and disruption which marked presbyterian history in Scotland and spilled over into Ireland. Seceders sometimes referred with respect to Rutherford, yet he had opposed both toleration and secession!

However, by the time of William, Rutherford had long passed from the earthly scene. When Charles II was restored in 1660 Rutherford was in danger because of his record of agitation against episcopacy and against the divine right of kings. His book, Lex Rex, laid him open to the charge of treason but he died before he could answer the summons to face the charge. He died in March 1661.

He can be remembered as a man of faith, courage and great learning, but his story is also a cautionary tale pointing out the perils of his controversies where the fires of abuse were continually stoked and were in danger of consuming the causes which he defended. It is good to be able to end with his last words which are inscribed on a plaque on the ruins of the old church at Anwoth where hundreds once heard his message

'Glory, Glory dwelleth in Emmanuel's land.' 56

R. Buick Knox.

NOTES:

1. The First Book of Discipline, ed. J.K. Cameron (Edinburgh, 1972)
2. The Second Book of Discipline, ed. J.Kirk (Edinburgh, 1980)
3. For Lives of Rutherford see DNB and Hew Scott, Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ, Vol. VII, 418; also introduction to various editions of his Letters, especially the edition of A.A. Bonar (2 Vol., 1863)
4. J.H.S. Burleigh, A Church History of Scotland (O.U.P., 1960), chapter III

5. The Divine Right of Church Government (1646), 23 & 28
6. Letters (ed. Bonar, I, 131
7. Ibid., I. 153, 156.
8. Ibid., I. 221
9. A. Whyte, Samuel Rutherford and some of his Correspondents (Edinburgh, 1894), 8.
10. J. Pelikan, Jesus through the Centuries (Yale U.P., 1985), ch. 10. Pelikan says that in medieval times the Song of Solomon was the book most read and commented upon in the cloister, more even than the four Gospels.
11. Letters, I. 91; even more lush examples on 52, 117.
12. Ibid., I. 78
13. Ibid., I. 164, 173, 195.
14. Ibid., I. 50
15. Ibid., I. 110
16. Ibid., I. 304. W.D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship (O.U.P., 1939), 131
17. Letters, II, 309 (20/10/1643)
18. Lex Rex (1644), 160
19. Ibid., 99
20. Ibid., 157
21. Ibid., 101-102
22. Ibid., 8-13
23. Ibid., 108, 138
24. R.S. Paul, The Assembly of the Lord (Edinburgh, 1985)
25. Letters, II, 311-12(4/3/44)
26. Ibid., II, 313
27. Ibid., II, 315(25/5/44)
28. The Due Right of Presbyteries (1644), 237. The matters raised in this paragraph are treated in detail on pp. 150, 187, 274-84, 289-98, 304-10, 355
29. Letters, II, 392.
30. A Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience (1649), 52.
31. Ibid., 120, 28
32. Ibid., 24, 35, 36. Jeremy Taylor became Bishop of Down and Connor and dealt harshly with the Presbyterians in his diocese which was increased by the addition of Dromore in 1661.
33. Ibid., address to the Reader
34. Ibid., 101, 106, 108, 240.
35. Ibid., 238-40. Letters, II, 423.
36. Letters, II, 423-4. See also The Due Right of Presbyteries, 242-3,
37. The Due Right of Presbyteries, 268. 258-67.
38. Letters, II, 423-4. See also The Due Right of Presbyteries, 78ff.
39. The Due Right of Presbyteries, 73.
40. The Divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication.
41. Letters, I. 204(3/1/37); 42. Letters, I. 309;
43. The Trial and Triumph of Faith, 30; 44. Ibid., 62;
45. Ibid., 31, 75; 46. ibid 308 47. ibid 41
48. Ibid., 129, 131; 49. ibid 196, 202 50. ibid 204, 265
51. Ibid., 219; 52. ibid 230-34 53. ibid 238; Gal. 3.13
54. Ibid., 242-4; 55. D. Felicitas Corrigan, Helen Waddell (London,
56. These words became the basis of the hymn, 1986) 53, 56; 'The sands of time are sinking'

A Plea for Tolerance (Mk 9.38-40)

E.A. Russell

A characteristic that attracted people to Jimmie Haire was not merely the remarkable warmth and friendliness of his personality but his essential humanity, expressed in his exceptional openness and sympathy for people of all persuasions and creeds. In an Ulster situation of bitter credal prejudice his influence within the College and among its students and throughout the church at large was salutary and served to strengthen the resolve of all those who sought reconciliation. It is in warm tribute to him that this passage has been chosen

The passage runs as follows:

38 John said to him: "Teacher, we saw someone casting out demons in your name who does not follow us and we tried to prevent him (~~because he was not following us~~) because he was not following us."

39. But Jesus said: "Do not prevent him; for no one who does a mighty act in my name will be able soon after to speak evil of me. 40. For he that is not against us, is for us."

This is an extraordinary story, peculiar to Mark and used with some alterations by Luke. It appears to have circulated on its own probably as oral tradition and can as easily end at v39 as at v40 with preference for the former. /1 Luke dispenses with v39 as unnecessary since the point is brought out sufficiently in v40. The saying of v40 also occurs in Q in connection with the Beelzebub controversy: "He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me, scatters" (The saying is identical in word and order in Lk and Mt: Mt 12.30; Lk 11.23)

We have here in Mk yet another instance of the very imperfect nature of the church as evidenced generally in the disciples (unless the word "disciple" as "learner" is to be taken seriously and Mk is showing how the church grows into maturity). They misunderstand Jesus' suffering vocation (8.31-33) or his resurrection (9.10); the manner of healing for a helpless church (9.29) or, in spite of a second prediction, Jesus' suffering (9.32) or what constitutes the order of the Kingdom of God (9.33-41); and here their repudiation of the unusual exorcist (9.38-39). The sequence of error, of misunderstanding or of helpless-

ss is driven home with little let up and only as the word Jesus is taken seriously and his mission understood can the church really represent Jesus to the world, can the kingdom come with power. (9.1)

The passage does not have clear links with what precedes. That appears to link them together is the catchword "in (your) name" and the situation of misunderstanding. Here is an exorcist extraordinary. We do not know his name. He could well be a representative of something that occurred frequently than Mk suggests if, as is claimed, he merely gives us typical instances of what happened in Jesus' ministry. What gives point to the whole story is that this man does not belong to the circle of disciples (*Ἰησοῦ ἀποστόλων*) his general understanding has been questioned by T.J. Weeden and others who consider the anonymous exorcist as a member of a Christian group separate from that of the disciples. /2 Thus we have here someone who does not share the call of Jesus or his command to preach or to expel demons (3.13,14) does not receive the instruction that Jesus gives to his disciples in private (4.34) but is among "those outside" (*ἐξωθεν*) (4.12) and yet this man uses Jesus' name. Here is someone of whom we have no record of repentance or of faith (4.15), basic requirements of true discipleship and yet has a remarkable manifestation of the power of God. Is there in this exorcism God's signal manifestation to this man, a manifestation of his Holy Spirit, which eventually drew him within the church? Is there a certain parallel in Lk's account of Cornelius who, before he is baptized, has a finite outpouring of the Holy Spirit? God does not always work within fixed categories nor can his action be dictated. Paul would probably describe such a man as "natural" (*φύσικος*), one who does not understand "the things of the Spirit" (1 Cor. 2.14 *τὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν*) though he does seem to have open the possibility of revelation within creation (Rom. 1.18ff). Here is one outside the traditional categories, who is happy to use Jesus' name without prejudice and demons are expelled.

Did this event take place in Jesus' time or does it come from the later church? Did people in Jesus' time take his name and use it for healing purposes? Quite apart from the awkward question of using the name, is it likely that the sick person would use an intermediary when it was possible

to consult Jesus? The Marcan presentation of the crowds who came for healing does suggest a wide-ranging and well-known ministry. It tends to make us forget that it is probable that the main centres of his ministry would be Capernaum, Bethsaida and Chorazin (cf Lk 10.13ff and par.) Use is made of 1 Cor.2.8 to support the claim that Jesus' ministry was not well-known ie if the rulers had been aware of Jesus and his work, they would not have crucified him. /3

A major obstacle to accepting the historicity of the account is the use of Jesus' name in exorcism. Does it suggest that Jesus is a heavenly being on whom the exorcist may call. /4 But is it really necessary that Jesus should be thought of as a divine being? Otto Böcher points out how varied are the names used in exorcism. Jews chose the name they considered effective eg the name of Yahweh or at the other end of the scale, the name of the prince of demons eg Beelzebub. Solomon also was a name used frequently which, with his reputation for wisdom, would not be surprising. The names of those who were known to be successful exorcists were also used. If this is the case, then it is not surprising if the name of Jesus should be used by a strange exorcist in Jesus' lifetime. /5 The expression "follows us" is unusual (ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῶν) though it could be merely a loose description for discipleship of Jesus. Further it could reflect a situation when the church had its own distinctive identity over against Judaism ie a period later than Jesus. Would the church however create such a story with its liberal outlook? /6 Others suggest that the sudden introduction of the name "John" without explanation favours historicity. /7

It is evident that the account caused embarrassment to the more rigid elements in the church. Mt prefers to leave it out. Indeed what record we have we owe to Mark who has a habit of saying startling or provocative things. For Mk Jesus is the central or focal point of exorcism. The appointment of the disciples for mission included preaching healing and exorcism. Yet it is only when Jesus sends them out that they do so (Mk 3.14f;6.7) Lk includes the pericope perhaps because he has come into the church from paganism and this makes him have a sympathy for all sorts and conditions of men and women, cutting across barriers where a Jew might have hesitated.

Attached to this brief passage, as we have seen, is the

me of John. John nowhere else in Mk appears without James and Peter (cf also Lk 9.49). In spite of the greater prominence he enjoys in the later church, in Mk John is either described as "the brother of James" (1.19;3.17) or his name follows that of James (1.29;5.37;9.2;10.35,41;13.3;14.33) thus it is only here in Mk that John alone speaks for the church ("WE saw...WE tried to prevent") and rather typically brings a critical report of the unusual exorcist who used Jesus' name and whom he tried to stop. If Mk as has been already suggested takes the story from oral tradition, he tells the story in his own way. This is suggested by the typical redundancy of "Who does not follow us" (ὁ οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῶν) and "because he does not follow us" (ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῶν) which redundancy may help to confirm what the original text says. Mk then expresses the original tradition in typically expansive fashion and this in turn brings out the point which must not be overlooked - "He does not follow us". The verb used (ἀκολουθεῖν) becomes in the synoptic gospels almost a technical term for discipleship (If it is used for the crowds who "follow" Jesus, does it suggest they are on the verge of discipleship or does it indicate the rich field of possibility that could await the church?) Therefore to say "He does not follow us" is in effect to say "He is not Disciple."

John is linked with another story of intolerance in the synoptic tradition. Jesus has sent disciples to prepare for his visit to a Samaritan village (9.52-56) The very fact that Lk takes the trouble to record this incident is in itself significant. Here and only here in Lk of the synoptic gospels do we have the story of a visit to a Samaritan village. This appears to contradict Jesus' instructions in Mt 23.39 where the disciples are told not to go to the Samaritans. (Lk 10.5) Mk is silent about any such mission. This must give rise to the query - Do Mt and Mk share an anti-Samaritan prejudice which they have not been able to overcome and which dictates the very material they choose for their gospel? Whatever may be the explanation, there could be no more likely mission than that chosen by Jesus in Samaria. This makes the record in the Fourth Gospel all the more remarkable for its success? Is it an attempt to rehabilitate the Samaritans in the eyes of the church or is their response (to make the lack of response of the "Jews" all the more comprehensible?) The prejudice was of long standing with both

sides suspicious of each other and tending to distrust any genuine movement of friendship. It is small wonder then if they refused to accept the advances of these strange Jews. Were James and John part of the group of messengers? It is possible they were not but managed to avoid taking part in the advance group. If this suggestion is feasible [Note the strange "seeing" ("ἰδόντες")], then this prejudice may have manifested itself earlier in reluctance to be part of the advance group of disciples. Whatever may be the situation, there can be no doubt about the inherent hostile bias which flared up at the insult offered by the Samaritans: "Do you want us to command fire to fall from heaven and destroy them?". The question misuses scripture to justify violent action. Prejudice does not scruple to quote scripture to justify its actions. The prejudice is compounded of injured pride, of contempt, along with a sense of superiority and disdain all the more acute since it came from the despised heretical Samaritans.

Thus we can the better build up the picture of John's intolerance. It is interesting that the description of James and John as "boanerges" ("sons of thunder") is only found in Mk. We could well have expected it to be appended in Lk to the account of the Samaritan mission. Lk may wish to avoid any slight on the two apostles, all the more necessary since it would come from a non-Jew. He would have known of the description, assuming he made use of the form of Mk's Gospel known to us. The weakness of this suggestion is that Lk does not scruple to include the account though it is possible that the original account did not include the names of the two brothers. / 8 Here again John has misunderstood the mind of Jesus. He has to receive instruction to become a more adequate disciple. Thus Jesus rebukes him on both occasions. It should be remembered that Mk and Lk address different situations and have their own distinctive point of view. Mk's view of the death of Jesus sees it, at least in part, as a triumph over evil spirits. It is a cosmic triumph and does not exclude the exorcisms that others may perform outside the church. They are not outside the implications of Jesus' death for the whole world. Further he can be interpreted as addressing the church in the post-Neronian period. It is a time when their membership has been decimated by persecution or desertion. Instances like that of the exorcist who uses Jesus' name could be a source

reassurance. The power of Jesus is still at work in the world even through strange channels. Luke on the other hand is sensitive to the divine plan as predestined and at work in the world where the church must continue for a time. He does not pedal or muffles the stress on the coming return of Jesus. He lays stress on the work that has to be completed first. His programme of expansion is unaltered. It is "Jerusalem and Samaria and to the ends of the earth". The pattern of its stamp on the Gospel of Luke as well as Acts where parallels can be traced clearly. It is in the will of God that the mission to the Samaritans be carried out whatever hindrances stand in the way.

On the return to the Marcan passage under consideration. There we have seen the church tries to stop the strange exorcist. The verb used for "stop" we have seen is $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$. The only other place in Mk where the word occurs is in connection with the blessing of the children. There is a poetic rhythm in the form of Jesus' saying:

Permit the children to come to me.

Do not prevent ($\mu\grave{\eta} \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$) them.

The kingdom of God is made up of such as these.

Yet again we have the rebuke of Jesus for conduct that is contrary to true discipleship. This story with those previously mentioned could be linked to the programme of reconstruction of the church. The way in which it begins: "They brought children to him that he might touch them" recalls healing stories (Mk 2.4; Mt 4.24 etc) / 9 Böhcher / 10 (it) takes the "touch" as referring to the laying on of hands (So Mt 19.13). People might understand this as warding off from the children hurtful spirits or perhaps the possibility of demons taking hold. Böhcher makes a strange suggestion by way of explanation of the disciples' hesitation. They fear reducing Jesus' power in his laying on of hands for blessing? Or had the children not made up their minds to Jesus or were under the control of demons like some exorcists? [It is hardly likely that the former could be said of "babes" (Lk first uses $\beta\rho\epsilon\acute{\phi}\eta$) but rather of older young people ($\pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ so all synn.)]

Note the strong expression used in Mk of Jesus' reaction. He is highly indignant ($\alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$). Yet again Mt and Lk omit an expression of emotion on Jesus' part. (They not really know one another's work?) This heighten-

ing of christology on their part is perhaps to guard against any diminution of the authoritative saying of Jesus as something spoken in extreme indignation or perhaps a result of extreme reserve in the use of human emotions of Jesus. The intolerance of the disciples of young people suggests children are unimportant. Rabbis were not always certain about the place of children, an uncertainty that extends to the church of today. / 11 The definitive saying of Jesus, shared in the course of preaching and teaching within the church, defines the position of children for the church. Indeed a claim is made that it has been shaped in the baptismal liturgy of the church.

Notes

1. Ernst Haenchen, Der Weg Jesu, Berlin 1966 prefers *ad loc.*
2. Theodore J. Weeden, Sr, Mark, Traditions in Conflict Fortress 1971 63
3. Haenchen, *op.cit.* writes: "Jesus hat nach 1 Kor.2.8 nicht so viele und so grosse Wunder getan, wie es nach der von Mk wiedergegebenen späteren Tradition aussieht. Schon das macht es unwahrscheinlich, dass ein jüdischer Exorzist bereits sich zu Jesu Lebzeiten den Namens Jesu bedient hat."
4. Haenchen, *op.cit.*
5. Christus Exorcista, Berlin 1972 88
6. Cf C.E.B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St Mark Cambridge 1959, 309
7. Cf K.L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, Berlin 1919, 236
8. Cf I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, Exeter 1978, 406 suggests a certain syntactical awkwardness in favour of such an omission.
9. Cf W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Markus, THKNT Berlin 1968, *ad loc.*
10. *ibid*, 83
11. Cf the valuable discussion of Grundmann, *op.cit.* 206